



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,076	07/27/2005	Heinz Hornung	2732-157	2799

6449 7590 06/05/2009
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HAGEMAN, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/05/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/520,076	Applicant(s) HORNUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark Hageman	Art Unit 3653	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Hageman. (3) Brian Tollefson.

(2) Patrick Mackey. (4) John Curry.

Date of Interview: 02 June 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,3,7 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Baudat, Maier.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the language of claim 1 and examiner clarified the rejection relative to the independent claim. Discussed the possibility of amending claim 12 to include a providing step or as an apparatus claim using means plus function recitations as ways to overcome the 112/2nd and 101 rejections. Discussed the limitations of claims 3 and 7 in light of amended claim 1 as possible ways of distinguishing the claims from the prior art of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Patrick H. Mackey/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3653
--	---